

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

1. Claims 1-65 were pending. Claims 1-25 have been canceled as being directed to non-elected subject matter. Claims 26, 33, 49, 52, and 56 have been amended. New claims 66-71 have been added. Therefore, claims 26-71 are now pending.

2. The Examiner has rejected claims 26-65 as being anticipated by Bloom alone or in combination with Ko. Specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 26-29, 34-42, 49-52, and 57-65 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bloom, and rejected claims 33 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Bloom in view of Ko (Applicants note that the Examiner also listed claims 26 and 49 as part of the 103 rejection, but provided no supporting commentary). Applicants also note that claims 30-32, 43-48, and 53-55 were identified on the Office Action Summary as being rejected, although no specific grounds for rejection were provided by the Examiner for these claims.

3. Independent claims 26 and 49 are directed generally to apparatus that control coupling of a container and a port assembly within a receiving chamber. In various embodiments described in the subject application, coupling is accomplished in such a way that the container and the port assembly are not decoupled, even after the receiving chamber is opened and the container assembly is removed from the receiving chamber. Among other things, such one-way coupling allows for safe disposal of the container assembly (see page 9, lines 11-13 of the application).

To the extent that Bloom provides for coupling of a container and a port assembly within a receiving chamber, it is clear that Bloom's container assembly controller decouples the container from the port assembly to allow for removal of the container and the port assembly. Likewise, to the extent that Ko provides for coupling of a container and a port assembly, it is clear that Ko's container assembly controller decouples the container from the port assembly to allow for removal of the container. Thus, neither Bloom nor Ko, alone or in combination, teach or otherwise suggest a container assembly controller for coupling of the container and the port assembly without allowing

decoupling of the container and the port assembly. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the claims are allowable over both Bloom and Ko.


4. The specification has been amended to provide the application numbers for the related applications.

5. All pending claims are believed to be in a form suitable for allowance. Therefore, the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests early allowance of the application. The Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned, Jeffrey T. Klayman, if it will assist further examination of this application.

6. Applicants do not believe any extension of time is required for timely consideration of this response. In the event that an extension has been overlooked, this conditional petition of extension is hereby submitted, and Applicants request that deposit account number 19-4972 be charged for any fees that may be required for the timely consideration of this application.

Date: June 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey T. Klayman  
Registration No. 39,250  
Attorney for Applicants

Bromberg & Sunstein LLP  
125 Summer Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1618  
Tel: (617) 443-9292  
Fax: (617) 443-0004  
01062/00D70 500008.1